



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/586,806	07/21/2006	Olivier J.M. Hus	GB04 0025 US1	9055
24738	7590	05/13/2009	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS			SARWAR, BABAR	
PO BOX 3001			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510-8001			2617	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/13/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/586,806	HUS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BABAR SARWAR	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 January 2009.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 concerning **claim 3** are withdrawn.
2. **Claim 3** has been amended.
3. **Claim 1-20** are currently pending.
4. Applicant's arguments filed on **01/27/2009** have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argued feature wherein "the subsequent transmitter behaviour corresponding to at least two non-contiguous ones of the quality ranges is identical." reads upon Sato as follows;

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The behaviour of transmitter corresponding to the non-contiguous quality ranges is identical, is read as transmission of the same multicast information to all the terminals. The claim language as interpreted broadly and reasonably does not exclude different coding rates and transmission rates.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sato et al. (US 2002/0003798A1), hereinafter referenced as Sato.

Consider **claim 1**, Sato discloses a method of operating a packet data multicast

communication system comprising a first station (**Fig. 4, where Sato discloses a wireless base station/information delivery apparatus**) and a plurality of second stations (**Fig. 4, where Sato discloses a plurality of wireless terminals A-D, H-L**), the first and second stations having transceiving equipment (**Figs. 2, 3 elements 21, and 11, where Sato discloses transceivers**) for communication between the first and second stations (**Abstract, where Sato discloses multicast services from base station to wireless terminals, therefore communication between the first and second stations**). Sato further discloses that the method comprises the first station transmitting a data packet and at least one of the plurality of the second stations receiving the data packet (**Para 0014, where Sato discloses communication between base station and wireless terminals**), characterized by the at least one of the plurality of the second stations measuring the quality of reception of the received data packet (**Para 0026, where Sato discloses wireless terminals measuring reception quality of the received data**), and determining into which one of at least three predetermined quality ranges the measured quality falls wherein the first station adopts a respective subsequent transmitter behavior in response to each of the at least three predetermined quality ranges (**Para 0102, Figs. 10, and 15, where Sato discloses transmission rates T1-T5 , therefore predetermined quality ranges**). Sato discloses that the subsequent transmitter behavior corresponding to at least two non-contiguous ones of the quality ranges is identical (**Para 0072, Fig. 8, 11, where Sato discloses mobile terminals A- D, H-L. The mobile terminals A-D, and H-L are non-contiguous for different transmission rates and reception qualities; since**

they receive the same multicast data from the information delivery apparatus, therefore the transmitter behavior is identical for non-contiguous quality ranges).

Consider **claim 2**, Sato discloses everything claimed as implemented above (see claim 1). In addition, Sato discloses that the method characterized by the second station transmitting indicia representative of the quality ranges other than said at least two non-contiguous quality ranges (**Para 0102, where Sato discloses modulation schemes corresponding to reception quality reported from the wireless terminals, therefore indicia representative of the quality ranges from the mobile terminals**).

Consider **claim 3**, Sato discloses everything claimed as implemented above (see claim 2). In addition, Sato discloses that the method characterized by the second station transmitting the indicia representative of the quality ranges in respect of each of the at least two non-contiguous quality ranges (**Para 0072, where Sato discloses modulation schemes corresponding to reception quality reported from the wireless terminals, therefore indicia representative of the quality ranges from the mobile terminals**).

Consider **claim 4**, Sato discloses everything claimed as implemented above (see claim 1). In addition, Sato discloses that the method characterized in that the at least two non-contiguous quality ranges are the best and the worst quality ranges (**Figs. 10, 15, where Sato discloses different Transmission rates T1-T5, therefore best and worst quality ranges**).

Consider **claim 5**, Sato discloses everything claimed as implemented above (see claim 1). In addition, Sato discloses that the method wherein the measuring of the

quality of reception of the received data packet is characterized by comparison of a measure of a predetermined quality metric of a received signal with at least three quality ranges (**Figs. 10, 15, where Sato discloses different modulation schemes and transmission rates**).

Consider **claim 6**, Sato discloses everything claimed as implemented above (see claim 5). In addition, Sato discloses that the method characterized in that the quality ranges are defined by threshold values applied by respective second stations (**Para 0073, where Sato discloses reception quality's predetermined level, therefore threshold**).

Consider **claim 7**, Sato discloses everything claimed as implemented above (see claim 5). In addition, Sato discloses that the method characterized in that the quality ranges are defined by threshold values signaled to the second stations by the first station (**Para 0073, where Sato discloses reception quality's predetermined level for the wireless terminals**).

Consider **claim 8**, Sato discloses everything claimed as implemented above (see claim 5). In addition, Sato discloses that the method characterized in that the predetermined quality metric comprises at least one of: Eb/N0 (energy per bit/noise density); the number of data packets received successfully in a predetermined time window; the proportion of data packets previously received correctly out of a group of predetermined number of packets; and the received SIR (Signal to Interference Ratio) or SNR (Signal to Noise Ratio) of another received signal (**Para 0059, where Sato discloses that the reception quality includes a reception level, an interference**

level, a noise level, and an error rate).

Consider **claim 9**, Sato discloses everything claimed as implemented above (see claim 8). In addition, Sato discloses that the method characterized in that the quality of reception of the received data packet is determined during a predetermined duration (**Para 0068, where Sato discloses a predetermined time period for a wireless station to receive multicast information, therefore measuring reception quality during a predetermined duration).**

Consider **claim 10**, Sato discloses everything claimed as implemented above (see claim 1). In addition, Sato discloses that the method characterized in that the first station adjusts one or more transmission parameters to ensure that at least a predetermined percentage of secondary stations receive a data packet data service satisfactorily (**Para 0077, where Sato discloses choosing spreading codes based on reception quality reported from the wireless terminals, therefore adjusting one or more transmission parameters).**

Consider **claim 11**, Sato discloses everything claimed as implemented above (see claim 10). In addition, Sato discloses that the method characterized in that the transmission parameters comprise one or more of: number of retransmissions; transmit power; spreading factor; code rate; and modulation scheme (**Para 0077, where Sato discloses transmission rates and spreading codes).**

Consider **claim 12**, Sato discloses everything claimed as implemented above (see claim 2). In addition, Sato discloses that the method characterized in that different of the indicia are distinguished by transmission at different times (**Para 0102, where**

Sato discloses mobile terminals reporting reception quality and the base station transmitting multicast data at different transmission rates, therefore indicia are distinguished by transmission at different times).

Consider **claim 13**, Sato discloses everything claimed as implemented above (see claim 2). In addition, Sato discloses that the method characterized in that different of the indicia are distinguished by different code words (**Para 0077, where Sato discloses mobile terminals reporting reception quality and the base station transmitting multicast data at different transmission rates, indicia are distinguished by different code words**).

Consider **claim 14**, Sato discloses everything claimed as implemented above (see claim 2). In addition, Sato discloses that the method characterized in that different of the indicia are distinguished by different frequency channels (**Para 0077, where Sato discloses mobile terminals reporting reception quality and the base station transmitting multicast data at different transmission rates, therefore indicia are distinguished by different frequency channels**).

Claim 15, as analyzed with respect to the limitations as discussed in claim 1.

Claim 16, as analyzed with respect to the limitations as discussed in claim 5.

Claim 17, as analyzed with respect to the limitations as discussed in claim 10.

Claim 18, as analyzed with respect to the limitations as discussed in claim 11.

Claim 19, as analyzed with respect to the limitations as discussed in claim 1.

Claim 20, as analyzed with respect to the limitations as discussed in claim 5.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BABAR SARWAR whose telephone number is (571)270-5584. The examiner can normally be reached on MONDAY TO FRIDAY 09:00 A.M -05:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, NICK CORSARO can be reached on (571)272-7876. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/BS/

/BABAR SARWAR/
Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/NICK CORSARO/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617